UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,362	04/11/2001	Mark Tuomenoksa	07937.0002-03000	7719

22852 7590 10/05/2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
AKPATI, ODAICHE T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/832,362	TUOMENOKSA, MARK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tracey Akpati	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 August 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4 received*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araujo (6393488 B1) in view of Boden et al (6615357 B1).

With respect to Claim 1, Araujo meets the limitation of "a method for enabling a network between a first processor and a second processor using at least one additional processor separate from the first processor and the second processor, wherein the first processor and the second processor are each identifiable by a name" on column 3, lines 45-49 and on column 5, lines 63-67; and "receiving, at the at least one additional processor, on behalf of the first processor, information that includes the name of the second processor" on column 6, lines 9-18; and "receiving, at the at least one additional processor, on behalf of the second processor, information that includes the name of the first processor" on column 6, lines 19-26; and "determining a first virtual address for the first processor based on the information received on behalf of the second processor and a second virtual address for the second processor based on the information received on behalf of the first processor, such that the first and second virtual addresses uniquely identify the first and second processors, respectively, and are routable through the network" on column 6, lines 26-33; and "providing, by the at least one additional processor, to the first processor the second virtual address and to the second processor the first

virtual address to enable one or more tunnels between the first and the second processors" partly on column 7, lines 3-13. The first processor is represented by the device in the first network while the second processor is represented by the device in the second network. The additional processor is represented by the NAT system. Araujo however does not explicitly state that tunnels are established between the two processors. However Boden et al discloses this on column 6, lines 4-9.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boden et al within the system of Araujo because tunneling allows for secure distribution of data within an insecure network.

With respect to Claim 2, Araujo meets all the limitation except for the following limitation. The limitation of "establishing, by the first processor, one or more tunnels from the first processor to the second processor using the first and second virtual addresses" is met by Boden et al on column 6, lines 4-9.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boden et al within the system of Araujo because tunneling allows for secure distribution of data within an insecure network.

With respect to Claim 3, Araujo meets all the limitation except for the following limitation. The limitation of "establishing, by the first processor, one or more tunnels through a base network from the first processor to the second processor using the first and second virtual

addresses" is met by Boden et al on column 6, lines 4-9. The NAT address used after the tunnel is set up is the virtual address.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boden et al within the system of Araujo because tunneling allows for secure distribution of data within an insecure network.

With respect to Claim 4, Araujo meets all the limitation except for the following limitation. The limitation of "establishing, by the first processor, one or more tunnels through a base network from the first processor to the second processor using the first and second virtual addresses" is met by Boden et al on column 6, lines 4-9.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boden et al within the system of Araujo because tunneling allows for secure distribution of data within an insecure network.

With respect to Claim 5, Araujo meets the limitation of "wherein each of the names includes a first portion and a second portion" on column 6, lines 9-14. The names include a URL name and a corresponding IP address.

With respect to Claim 6, Araujo meets all the limitation except for the following limitation. The limitation of "establishing a tunnel between the first processor and the at least one additional processor to communicate information between the first processor and the at least

one additional processor" is met by Boden et al on column 6, lines 4-9. The VPN NAT represents the additional processor.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boden et al within the system of Araujo because tunneling allows for secure distribution of data within an insecure network.

With respect to Claim 7, Araujo meets the limitation of "receiving, at the at least one additional processor, the information on behalf of the first processor through the tunnel established between the first processor and the at least one additional processor" on column 6, lines 9-14. The PC represents the first processor.

With respect to Claim 9, Araujo meets the limitation of "determining information about a first local network connected to the first processor based on the information received on behalf of the second processor and information about a second local network connected to the second processor based on the information received on behalf of the first processor, wherein each local network includes one or more other processors separate from the at least one additional processor" on column 3, lines 45-49; and "providing by the at least one additional processor to the first processor the information regarding the local network connected to the second processor and to the second processor the information regarding the local network connected to the first processor" on column 5, lines 63-67 and on column 6, lines 1-8; and "enabling communications between the one or more other processors in the first local network and the one or more other processors in the second local network using the information about the first and second local

networks" on column 5, lines 45-49. Araujo however does not explicitly meet the following limitation.

The limitation of "establishing, by the first processor, one or more tunnels from the first processor to the second processor using the first and second virtual addresses" is met by Boden et al on column 5, lines 49-54.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boden et al within the system of Araujo because tunneling allows for secure distribution of data within an insecure network.

With respect to Claim 10, its limitation is similar to Claim 9 limitation. The first local interface is inherent with the information regarding the connections established between the two processors as disclosed in Araujo on column 3, lines 60-67 and on column 4, lines 1-10.

With respect to Claim 12, its limitation is similar to Claim 1 limitation and hence its rejection can be found therein.

With respect to Claim 13, its limitation is similar to Claim 2 limitation and hence its rejection can be found therein.

With respect to Claim 14, all the limitation is met by Araujo except for the following limitation. The limitation of "meansfor establishing a tunnel between the first processor and the

system to communicate information between the first processor and the system" is met by Boden et al on column 6, lines 4-9.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boden et al within the system of Araujo because tunneling allows for secure distribution of data within an insecure network.

With respect to Claim 15, Araujo partly meets the limitation of "a tunneling interface that receives, on behalf of the first processor, information that includes a name of the second processor, and receives, on behalf of the second processor, information that includes the name of the first processor" on column 7, lines 40-48; and "a controller that determines a first virtual address for the first processor based on the information received on behalf of the second processor and a second virtual address for the second processor based on the information received on behalf of the first processor such that the first and second virtual addresses uniquely identify the first and second processors, respectively, and are routable through the network, and provides to each of the first and second processors the first and second virtual addresses to enable one or more tunnels between the first and the second processors" on column 7, lines 53-65 and on column 4, lines 54-56. Even though Araujo discloses a NAT being implemented in a VPN, he however does not explicitly disclose tunnels as being established between the end nodes. This is however disclosed by Boden et al on column 6, lines 4-9.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boden et al within the system of Araujo because tunneling allows for secure distribution of data within an insecure network.

Claims 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araujo (6393488 B1) in view of Boden et al (6615357 B1) in further view of Valencia (5918019).

With respect to Claim 8, the combination of Araujo and Boden et al meet all the limitation except for the following limitation. The limitation of "determining, based on the information received on behalf of the second processor, information about a firewall that selectively restricts a flow of information into the first processor; and providing, by the at least one additional processor, to the firewall the determined information such that information flowing from the second processor to the first processor on the enabled one or more tunnels is allowed by the firewall into the first processor" is met by Valencia on column 4, lines 21-43.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Valencia within the combination of Araujo and Boden et al because the firewall is necessary to protect a private network from external intruders.

With respect to Claim 11, all the limitation is already discussed in Claim 10 rejection except for the limitation of a cryptographic information being the data that is exchanged between the two processors. This limitation is met by Valencia on column 7, lines 1-32.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Valencia within the combination of Araujo and Boden et al because encrypting information before it is sent prevents an attacker from being able to decipher the information being sent.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracey Akpati whose telephone number is 703-305-7820. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-6.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 703-305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Please note the Patent Office will be moving to the Alexandria campus in October. The new phone number for myself, Tracey Akpati is (571) 272-3846, my SPE, Kim Vu is (571) 272-3859 and the receptionist is (571) 272-2100.

OTA

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 21